

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of Costa Mesa	Amount Requested	\$2,000,000
------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title	Industrial Way Storm Drain Improvements	Total Proposal Cost	\$4,000,000
-----------------------	---	----------------------------	-------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Industrial Way Storm Drain Improvement Project proposes to install a parallel underground storm drain system from Pomona and 18th Streets to Newport Blvd. in the City of Costa Mesa and the construct two detention basins to encourage the natural percolation of low flow run off into the ground. The new system will include bio-filtration systems and gross pollution filtration devices to comply with NPDES. The entire project is within the City of Costa Mesa's CDBG area and benefits a disadvantaged community.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	6/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	2/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	0/12
Schedule	1/5	Program Preferences	0/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	1/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			13

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. For example, the only description of the actual Project is a single sentence in the “Existing Data and Studies” section. Project goals and objectives are identified, as is the purpose and need, but both sections failed to discuss how they relate to the adopted Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). A section of the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority IRWMP and One Water One Watershed (OWOW) planning process is provided and this Project is listed on the OWOW Master Project List. Project status is listed at 30% design stage. Two maps showing relative Project location are provided, but without a legend to explain the color markings, the maps are difficult to understand. A description of existing data and studies is provided, and the “Purpose and Need” section cited the findings of a hydrology analysis, but no supporting documentation is provided. Project Specifics are given as to how the Project functions in relation to other

stormwater or sewage conveyance systems. Project Timing and Phasing are not addressed. The tasks for the Project are essentially copied from the sample in the PSP of a typical Work Plan outline with no description of work to be done, nor permitting, planning and design, environmental documentation, etc. Tasks for construction, environmental compliance/mitigation/enhancement, and construction administration are lumped together in a list. Overall, the tasks are not sufficient enough to demonstrate that this Project could be implemented.

Budget

A majority of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the Budget categories. For example, the percentage funding match totals in the Summary budget add up to 100%, when the actual match shown is for 50% of the total project funding. A majority of the Budget categories do not follow the tasks shown in the Work Pplan. The detailed Project Budget contains itemized pricing of work items, but it does not discuss how the costs were derived or how they relate to the summary Budget. For example, the detailed Project Budget apparently lumps together the \$300,000 of Direct Project Administration with the \$200,000 of Construction Administration costs, with no basis for the costs. The costs do not appear reasonable without supporting documentation.

Schedule

The Schedule criterion is not consistent with the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, and is minimally addressed and not documented. The Schedule was given as a list of tasks with no start and end dates or milestones shown, as required. The construction bid is scheduled to be awarded in September 2012, although construction is not scheduled to begin until November 2012.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criterion was minimally addressed and not documented. The desired outcomes did not relate to the Project goals. For example, the goals include protecting human life and property from flood waters, minimize inflow into sanitary sewer, protect and enhance sensitive fresh and salt water environments; where, the desired outcomes include cost and resource savings for the public, develop better communication and trust, focus on building a successful project, and improve public health. There were no output or outcome indicators mentioned, nor were there targets to make any assumption that this could be a feasible Project. A Project Performance Measures Table required by the PSP was not provided. There was no discussion on how the project is consistent with the Basin Plan.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Only low levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. The FDR analysis is largely based on assumptions or numbers stated with little or no supporting documentation. Also, no water supply benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Water Quality and Other Expected benefits are not claimed in this Proposal. No water quality or other benefits are discussed in Attachment 9 or any of the economics attachments.

Program Preferences

The Proposal does not address any Program Preferences in relation to the proposed project. The applicant merely mentions that the Project meets Practice Integrated Flood Management and Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits Program Preferences, and they assist Disadvantaged Communities. There is no supporting documentation provided.